

REMARKS

In the February 8, 2005 Office Action, all of the claims 1-20 stand rejected in view of prior art. No other objections or rejections are made in the Office Action.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the February 8, 2005 Office Action, Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 6, 14, 17, and 19 as indicated above. Claims 4, 6, 14, 17, and 19 have been amended merely to correct errors in translation. Thus, claims 1-20 are pending, with claim 1 being the only independent claim. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following comments.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

On pages 2-3 of the Office Action, claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,045,076 to Daniels ("Daniels patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,412,722 to Kreuser ("Kreuser patent"). In response, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to recite that the spool control unit is configured to start braking the spool when the tension falls after having increased due to rotation of the spool before the rotational speed of the spool reaches its maximum value. Applicants believe that none of the prior art of record disclose or suggest the arrangement of claim 1.

More specifically, Applicants believe that the Daniels patent and the Kreuser patent do not disclose or suggest the spool braking control in which the spool is braked when the tension of the fishing line falls below a predetermined constant value before the rotational speed of the spool reaches its peak. As discussed on page 3, lines 8-23 of the specification as originally filed, the present inventors have discovered that, when the spool is braked for a very brief period of time just before the rotational speed of the spool reaches its peak as the tension of the fishing line falls below a predetermined value, the lure will turn and change its orientation so that the end of the lure opposite the end attached to the fishing line moves forward, and the flying distance of the lure increases. None of the prior art of record disclose or suggest the novel concept of this invention, which is to brake the spool after the tension of the fishing line falls below a predetermined value.

Regarding the Daniels patent, it has been cited in the Office Action to show the basic structure of an electrically controllable spool braking unit. The Daniel patent discloses a tension-responsive variable flexibility pole 36 and a reel 58 in which the braking of the spool

is controlled via the first and second electrodes 74 and 76, the friction plate disposed between the first and second electrodes 74 and 76, and variable viscosity fluid contained in the container 78. (Column 9, lines 9-40, Figure 5). There is no disclosure or suggestion in the Daniel patent in what manner the braking force should be applied. In other words, the Daniel patent does not disclose or suggest the braking of the spool that is performed when the tension of the fishing line falls below a predetermined value. Clearly, the Daniel patent does not disclose or suggest the arrangement of claim 1.

Regarding the Kreuser patent, it has been apparently cited in the Office Action to show a plurality of magnets and a plurality of serially connected coils. The Kreuser patent does not, however, disclose or suggest the braking of the spool that is performed when the tension of the fishing line falls below a predetermined value, as required by claim 1 of the present application.

More specifically, as seen in Figure 6 of the Kreuser patent, the braking force is applied to the spool *when the spool starts rotating* (first braking at F1) and *after the rotational speed of the spool reaches its peak 158* (at F1, F2, F3, and F4).

This first braking of the Kreuser patent does not satisfy the requirement of claim 1, because it occurs too soon. At the time of the first braking, the spool just started rotating. Therefore, the tension of the fishing line is *increasing*, as opposed to *falling*, when the first braking at F1 occurs. When the spool is braked at the outset of the spool rotation in this manner, the flying distance of the lure tends to be compromised. This is clearly contrary to the requirement of claim 1, since claim 1 as now amended requires that the spool be braked *when the tension falls, after an increase due to the rotation of the spool*. Thus, the first braking of the Kreuser patent occurs too soon to satisfy the requirement of claim 1.

The subsequent braking of the Kreuser patent does not satisfy the requirement of claim 1 either, because it occurs too late. As shown in Figure 6, the subsequent braking of F1-F4 occurs *after the rotational speed of the spool reaches its peak 158*. This is clearly contrary to the requirement of claim 1, since claim 1 as now amended requires that the spool be braked when the tension falls *before the rotational speed of the spool reaches its peak*. In other words, the second braking of the Kreuser patent occurs too late to satisfy the requirement of claim 1. Thus, the Kreuser patent does not disclose or suggest the

Appl. No. 10/751,461
Amendment dated May 6, 2005
Reply to Office Action of February 8, 2005

arrangement of claim 1 as now amended, either singularly or in combination with the Daniels patent.

Moreover, Applicants believe that dependent claims 2-20 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 1, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Applicants particularly believe that claims 8, 10, 11, and 13-20 are allowable, since claim 8 requires that the second braking force be smaller than the first braking force, while the braking forces F1-F4 of the Kreuser patent are clearly increasing in this order. Thus, Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the invention as set forth in independent claim 1, the prior art of record also fails to disclose or suggest the inventions as set forth in dependent claims 2-20.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn in view of the above comments and amendments.


Prior Art Citation

In the Office Action, additional prior art references are made of record. Applicants believe that these references do not render the claimed invention obvious.

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-20 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Kiyoe K. Kabashima
Reg. No. 54,874

SHINJYU GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444
Dated: May 6, 2005

G:\04-APR05-MTSN-US020836 Amendment.doc